

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application of which claims 1, 10, 16, 20, 21 and 25 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 16, 20 and 21 have been amended. Claims 25-26 have been added. No new matter has been introduced by way of the claim amendments, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bowers et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,963,134). The above rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

**Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The test for determining if a reference anticipates a claim, for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, is whether the reference discloses all the elements of the claimed combination, or the mechanical equivalents thereof functioning in substantially the same way to produce substantially the same results. As noted by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Lindemann Maschinenfabrick GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984), in evaluating the sufficiency of an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Court stated:

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.

Therefore, if the cited reference does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, then the cited reference fails to anticipate the claimed invention and, thus, the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited reference.

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bowers et al. For at least the reasons set forth below, Bowers, however, fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20, and 21. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20, and 21 and dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-19, which depend from independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20, and 21, are believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 1 recites a resource registration method comprising "reading the tag to obtain an identifier for the entity" and "using the identifier to obtain an address for a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity."

Bowers et al. discloses an inventory system using library books with RFID tags. The books are deposited into a bin having an interrogator which reads the RFID tags and stores information regarding the contents of the bin. See Figure 6. Additionally, Bowers et al. discloses the use of a portable reader to interrogate the RFID tag in order to collect status information which may then be stored in a database. See Column 9 lines 59-63. The status information in Bowers et al. includes check in/out status, location, item identification information, and patron ID. See Figure 4. Bowers et al. maintains a database system for a plurality of books or documents within a library system.

Bowers et al., however, fails to teach or suggest "reading the tag to obtain an identifier for the entity" and "using the identifier to obtain an address for a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity" as recited in independent claim 1. Instead, Bowers et al. discloses that "article identification information" is obtained, wherein the article identification information correlates with tag identification information for identifying an article. (Column 10, lines 25-30). Location information is also used to identify the article 22. (Column 10, lines 40-45). However, neither the article identification

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

information nor the location information includes "an address for a resource associated with the entity" as recited in independent claim 1. Instead, the identification information is obtained for the article 22 (e.g. library books), and not for "a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity." Support for the claim amendments reciting "wherein the resource describes or controls the entity" is found on page 13 of the original filed application.

Moreover, independent claim 1 recites both "entity" and resource." Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest both an "entity" and a "resource" as claimed. The Office Action recites that Bowers allegedly teaches, at column 9 line 55 - column 10 line 21 and at column 10 lines 36-46, a resource registration method comprising

"using the identifier to obtain an address for the resource" (Office Action, page 3)

Independent claim 1 states "using the identifier to obtain an address for a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity." The Office Action appears to allege that Bowers discloses an identifier "to obtain an address for a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity." The Applicants assert that Bowers et al. fails, however, to teach or suggest using the identifier to obtain an address for "a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity" as claimed. Instead, Bowers et al. discloses storing a physical address for a book. The physical address for a book is the location of the book within the shelves of the library and is input by a user. See Column 15 Lines 21-57. Therefore, the identifier is not used "to obtain an address for a resource" associated with the book, but merely to identify the book itself.

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

Independent claim 1 recites a resource registration method comprising "reading the tag to obtain an identifier for the entity" and "using the identifier to obtain an address for a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity." Claim 1 recites an "entity" and a "resource associated with the entity." The article 22 (e.g. library book) disclosed by Bowers et al. cannot constitute both an "entity" and a "resource associated with the entity" as claimed. A tag associated with the entity is read in order to retrieve information to register the resource. Instead of reading a tag to retrieve information to register a resource, Bowers et al. discloses reading an RFID tag in order to determine the location of the book having the tag. Bowers et al. discloses a book, but fails to teach or suggest a resource associated with the book. In addition, the physical address of the book is different from the address of a resource. For at least these reasons, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 1.

Independent claim 10 recites a resource registration method comprising "physically approaching a resource that is connected to a network," "sending an address of a registry to a target device" and "the target device having an address for receiving the address of the registry and responsive thereto for accessing the registry through the network by employing the address of the registry, and for binding the address of the target device to a web page of a physical location in the registry." The inventory system of Bowers et al. does not include a target device "having an address for receiving the address of the registry and responsive thereto for accessing the registry." Instead, the inventory system disclosed by Bowers et al. includes a portable reader to interrogate an RFID tag to collect status information on books in a library. The inventory system of Bowers et al. is used to track circulation status information, but does not include a "target device" that receives the address of a registry. In

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

addition, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest that the inventory system includes "a resource that is connected to a network," a registry, or a target device as recited in claim 10. For at least these reasons, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 10.

Independent claim 16 recites a resource registration method comprising "physically approaching an entity that has an associated beacon," "reading the beacon to obtain an address for a resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity" and "binding the address of the resource in a registry." The inventory system of Bowers et al. tracks the status of books in a library, but does not read a beacon to obtain an address for a resource associated with a library book. For at least these reasons, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 16.

Independent claim 20 recites a registration system including features similar to those recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 16. The inventory system of Bowers et al. tracks circulation status information on books in a library, but does not operate as a registration system comprising "a resource that needs to be registered" as claimed in independent claim 20. For at least these reasons, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 20.

Independent claim 21 recites a registration system for a resource, the registration system comprising "means for using the identifier to obtain an address for a resource" and "means for binding the address for the resource in a registry." For at least the reasons set forth above, the inventory system of Bowers et al. does not operate as a registration system for registering a resource, but instead operates as a tracking system for library books. For at

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

least these reasons, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 21.

In addition, for at least the reasons set forth above, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest "a resource associated with an entity." Instead, as indicated above, Bowers et al. discloses an article 22 and identification information used to identify the article 22. The article 22 disclosed by Bowers et al. does not include both an "entity" and a "resource associated with the entity, wherein the resource describes or controls the entity" as claimed. Instead, the tagged articles in the inventory system of Bowers et al. is used only for tracking the tagged articles, and not for obtaining an address for a resource associated with tagged articles, or for binding the address of the resource in a registry.

Accordingly, Bowers et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the features contained in independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20 and 21, and thus these claims are believed to be allowable. Claims 2-9 depend upon allowable claim 1, claims 11-15 depend upon allowable claim 10, claims 17-19 depend upon allowable claim 16, and claims 22-24 depend upon allowable claim 21, and are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Response to "Response to Arguments"

The Office Action alleges that Bowers et al. discloses "using the identifier to obtain an address for the resource" (Office Action, page 6). The Office Action appears to equate "circulation status information" of a tagged article such as a library book with "an address for the resource" as claimed. However, the tags used to identify the library books of Bowers et

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

al. are used for obtaining information about the books, such as location information, not resources associated with the books.

Additionally, the Office Action alleges that "the on-line catalog can be a libraries website." (Office Action, page 6) However, the Office Action fails to clearly articulate where Bowers et al. explicitly discloses the alleged "libraries website" and a library website is not taught by Bowers et al. Dependent claim 3 recites "wherein the registry is a computational abstraction that can be browsed by users in the form of web pages; and wherein the registry can be queried automatically by other programs." Dependent claim 6 recites "wherein the address for the resource is a URL." Dependent claim 9 recites "generating a web page for the registry." These features relate to web pages and universal resource locators. Bowers et al. fails to teach web pages or URLs and therefore fails to teach all of the features contained in claims 3, 6, and 9. Claims 11, 14, 17, and 18 recite features similar to the features in claims 3, 6, and 9 and therefore are also allowable over Bowers et al. for similar reasons.

**Newly Added Claims**

Claims 25 and 26 have been added. Claims 25 and 26 each recite "a registry including a corresponding registry address, wherein the registry can be browsed by users in the form of the at least one web page of physical locations, and further wherein the registry can be queried automatically by other programs" and "a portable computing device, wherein the portable computing device includes the registry address that corresponds to the registry, further wherein the portable computing device includes a first communication interface for sending the registry address to a resource, wherein the resource is connected to a network,

**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Scr. No.: 09/871,082

further wherein the resource describes or controls an entity, further wherein the entity is associated with a collection of entities, further wherein the resource includes a second communication interface and a receiver for receiving the registry address from the portable computing device, further wherein the second communication interface communicates with the registry through the network, and further wherein the resource includes a physical registration program having a registry interface unit for sending a resource address of the resource to the registry" which is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow claims 25 and 26.



**PATENT**

Atty Docket No.: 10006135-1

App. Ser. No.: 09/871,082

**Conclusion**


In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy P.J. KINDBERG et al.

Dated: June 15, 2005

By

  
Ashok K. Mannava  
Registration No.: 45,301

MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.  
8221 Old Courthouse Road  
Suite 104  
Vienna, VA 22182  
(703) 652-3822  
(703) 880-5270 (facsimile)